

Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)  
Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)  
TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP  
One Ferry Building, Suite 355  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 788-8200  
Facsimile: (415) 788-8208  
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com  
Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

Kenneth A. Gallo (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Joseph J. Simons (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Craig A. Benson (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP  
2001 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-1047  
Telephone: (202) 223-7300  
Facsimile: (202) 223-7420  
Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com  
Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com  
Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com

*Attorneys for Sharp Electronics Corporation and  
Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Master File No. 3:07-5944-SC  
Individual Docket No. 13-cv-1173-SC

MDL No. 1917

\_\_\_\_\_  
This Document Relates to:

*Sharp Electronics Corp. et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd.*  
*et al.*, No. 13-cv-01173.

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]  
ORDER RE RESPONSE TO EXPECTED  
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

1 Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company  
 2 of America, Inc. (collectively, “Sharp”) and Defendant Technologies Displays Americas LLC (“TDA”) enter into this Stipulation concerning the matter entitled *Sharp Electronics Corp. et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd. et al.*, No. 13-cv-01173, which was related to *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, No. 07-cv-05944, (the “MDL Proceedings”) by an Order of Judge Samuel Conti on March 26, 2013.

6 SUBJECT TO THE COURT’S APPROVAL, THE PARTIES STIPULATE AND  
 7 AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

8 WHEREAS, on March 15, 2013, Sharp filed a complaint in the Northern District of  
 9 California alleging antitrust violations by manufacturers, distributors and sellers of CRT and CRT  
 10 Products, captioned *Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.*, No. 13-cv-01173 (the “Sharp  
 11 Complaint”);

12 WHEREAS, the Sharp Complaint named TDA as a defendant, the first such instance  
 13 where TDA has been made a party to any case involving claims related to the MDL Proceedings;

14 WHEREAS, on September 26, 2013, Sharp and TDA entered into a stipulation and  
 15 proposed order concerning the schedule for TDA to file an answer or motion to dismiss the Sharp  
 16 Complaint and a briefing schedule for any motion to dismiss that TDA filed (Dkt. 55; MDL Dkt. 1957);

17 WHEREAS, on September 26, 2013, the Court granted the order provided in the parties’  
 18 stipulation as proposed (Dkt. 57; Dkt. MDL 1961);

19 WHEREAS, while the parties’ stipulation and proposed order was pending before the  
 20 Court, the Court issued its order granting Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.’s motion to dismiss the  
 21 Sharp Complaint as to Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc., and granting Sharp leave to file an  
 22 amended complaint (Dkt. 56; MDL Dkt. 1960);

23 WHEREAS, Sharp intends to file an amended complaint (the “Amended Complaint”);

24 WHEREAS, Sharp and TDA have agreed that they will negotiate a mutually agreeable  
 25 response date and briefing schedule for TDA to respond to the Amended Complaint after the Amended  
 26 Complaint is filed; and

1 WHEREAS, Sharp and TDA agree that the Court should vacate its earlier order setting a  
2 response date and briefing schedule for TDA with respect to the Sharp Complaint.

3 NOW, THEREFORE, PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6-1(b), SHARP AND  
4 TECHNOLOGIES DISPLAYS AMERICAS LLC, BY AND THROUGH THEIR RESPECTIVE  
5 COUNSEL OF RECORD, HEREBY STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:

6 1. The Court's order (Dkt. 57; MDL Dkt. 1961), issued on the parties' stipulation,  
7 setting a response date and briefing schedule for TDA with respect to the Sharp Complaint shall be  
8 vacated;

9 2. Promptly after Sharp files its Amended Complaint, counsel for Sharp and counsel for  
10 TDA shall confer and negotiate a new date for TDA to respond to the Amended Complaint and dates for  
11 briefing in the event that TDA's response to the Amended Complaint is a motion to dismiss, and  
12 the parties' agreed response date and briefing schedule shall be submitted by stipulation to this Court for  
13 consideration and approval.

14  
15 Dated: October 4, 2013

By: /s/ Jonathan A. Patchen  
Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)  
Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)  
TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP  
One Ferry Building, Suite 355  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (415) 788-8200  
Facsimile: (415) 788-8208  
Email: staylor@tcolaw.com  
Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com

20  
21 Kenneth A. Gallo (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Joseph J. Simons (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
Craig A. Benson (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
22 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP  
2001 K Street, NW  
23 Washington, DC 20006-1047  
Telephone: (202) 223-7300  
24 Facsimile: (202) 223-7420

25 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corp. and Sharp*  
26 *Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.*  
27

1 By: /s/ Nathan Lane III  
2 Nathan Lane III  
3 Mark C. Dosker  
4 SQUIRE SANDERS (US) LLP  
5 275 Battery Street, Suite 2600  
6 San Francisco, CA 94111  
7 Tel: (415) 954-0200  
8 Fax: (415) 393-9887

*Attorney for Defendant Technologies Displays Americas  
LLC*

9 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this document  
10 has been obtained from each of the above signatories.

11 Dated: October 4, 2013 /s/ Jonathan A. Patchen

12 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2013 \_\_\_\_\_